Ref.

OPINIONS AND DECLARATIONS RENDERED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the Commission

VOLUME 2. Part 36. Pp. 375-398.

OPINION 166

On the status of the names *Pompilus* Fabricius, 1798, and *Psammochares* Latreille, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) and of the alleged generic name *Pompilus* Schneider, 1784 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea)

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature Sold at the Publications Office of the Commission 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

1945

Price six shillings

(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION

The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. Karl Jordan, Ph.D., F.R.S. (United Kingdom).

Vice-President: Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.).

Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (United Kingdom).

The Members of the Commission

· Class 1946

Herr Professor Dr. Walter ARNDT (Germany). Dr. William Thomas CALMAN (United Kingdom). Professor Teiso ESAKI (Japan). Professor Béla von HANKÓ (Hungary). Dr. Tadeusz JACZEWSKI (Poland). Dr. Norman R. STOLL (U.S.A.).

Class 1949

Senor Dr. Angel CABRERA (Argentina).
Mr. Francis HEMMING (United Kingdom) (Secretary to the Commission).
Dr. Karl JORDAN (United Kingdom) (President of the Commission).
Dr. Joseph PEARSON (Australia).
Monsieur le Docteur Jacques PELLEGRIN (France).
Herr Professor Dr. Rudolf RICHTER (Germany).

Class 1952

Senhor Dr. Afranio do AMARAL (Brazil).
Professor James Chester BRADLEY (U.S.A.).
Professor Ludovico di CAPORIACCO (Italy).
Professor J. R. DYMOND (Canada).
Dr. James L. PETERS (U.S.A.) (Vice-President of the Commission).
Dr. Harold E. VOKES (U.S.A.).

Secretariat of the Commission:

British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, S.W. 7.

Publications Office of the Commission: 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W. 7.

Personal address of the Secretary: 83, Fellows Road (Garden Flat), London, N.W. 3.



Ref.

OPINION 166.

ON THE STATUS OF THE NAMES *POMPILUS* FABRICIUS, 1798, AND *PSAMMOCHARES* LATREILLE, 1796 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA) AND OF THE ALLEGED GENERIC NAME *POMPILUS* SCHNEIDER, 1784 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER NAUTILOIDEA).

SUMMARY.—Under suspension of the rules (i) the name Psammochares Latreille, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) is hereby suppressed: (ii) the name Pompilus is hereby suppressed as a generic name in so far as it may have been so used prior to the publication of the name Pompilus Fabricius, 1798; (iii) the name Pompilus Fabricius, 1798, is hereby validated; (iv) all type designations for Pompilus Fabricius, 1798, made prior to the date of the present Opinion, are hereby set aside; and (v) Pompilus pulcher Fabricius, 1798, is hereby designated as the type of Pompilus Fabricius, 1798. There is no such generic name as Pompilus Schneider, 1784 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea), the name "Pompilus" having been published by Schneider as the specific trivial name of a species assigned by him to the genus Octopodia Schneider, 1784. The name Pompilus Fabricius, 1798, validated as above and with Pompilus pulcher Fabricius, 1798, as type, is hereby added to the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology as Name No. 612.

I.—THE STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

As the result of consultations initiated by Professor James Chester Bradley with the leading systematic workers in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta) in all countries, the following petition signed by Professor Chester Bradley and 59 other hymenopterists was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:—

THE CASE OF POMPILUS VERSUS PSAMMOCHARES

Psammochares Latr., 1796, was proposed without included species. In 1802 ¹ (Hist. Nat. vol. III), Latreille adopted the Fabrician name Pompilus for his Psammochares for reasons of euphony.

¹ The full reference is Latreille, [1802-1803] (in Sonnini's Buffon), Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins. 3: 334. For the authority for the date here assigned to this volume, see Griffin, 1938, J. Soc. Bibl. nat. Hist. 1:157.

Although subsequently cited by Latreille as a synonym of Pompilus, and once by Westwood (1840) Psammochares after Latreille's adoption of Pompilus to replace it escaped the attention of catalogers. It does not appear in Dalla Torre's Catalogus Hymenopterorum. It did not again come into use until Banks (Journ. N.Y. ent. Soc., 1910, 18:114) pointed out the facts above stated, and showed that under the rules Psammochares and PSAMMOCHARIDAE must replace Pompilus and POMPILIDAE.

Supporting the adoption of *Psammochares* in lieu of *Pompilus* was the supposed fact pointed out by Fox (1901) that *Pompilus* was preoccupied in Cephalopoda. But it now appears that Pompilus is not preoccupied. Dr. H. A. Pilsbry kindly informs us that Schneider's pompilus was a specific,

not a generic name.2

The undersigned respectfully request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to take the following action:—

(1) to suspend the rules in the cases of the genera Psammochares Latr. and Pompilus Fabr.;

(2) to permanently reject Psammochares Latreille (originally proposed without included species);

(3) to validate Pompilus Fabr., 1798, type Sphex viaticus L. (by designation of Latreille, 1810);
(4) to place on the Official List of Generic Names, Pompilus Fabr., type

Sphex viaticus L., for the genus of fossorial wasps ordinarily known by that name.

2. The following is the list of signatures attached to the above petition at the time of its submission to the International Commission: -

C. T. Brues	R. Benoist *	H. Haupt
	J. D. Alfken *	H. Brauns ‡
G. Grandi	A. Krausse	L. Berland
A. B. Gahan *	H. Wolff	A. A. Oglobin
		O. W. Richards
	R. Fouts	P. P. Babiy
H. H. Ross *	G. Arnold	V. S. L. Pate
J. M. Dusmet		J. C. Bradley
W. M. Wheeler *	I. Micha	G. Enderlein
G. T. Lyle	H. Hacker	T. Uchida †
R. A. Cushman *	A. C. Kinsey *	O. Vogt †
E. A. Elliott		H. Habermehl †
	F. Maidl	R. Kruger †
	P. Roth	W. Hellen †
R. Friese	E. Enslin	F. X. Williams †
H. von Ihering ‡	A. von Schulthess	O. Schmiedeknecht †
	R. B. Benson *	N. N. Kuznezov-
	H. F. Schwarz	Ugamtsky †
H. Bischoff	W. V. Balduf *	F. E. Lutz
L. Masi	D. S. Wilkinson *	L. H. Weld *
* T		

* In accord with results sought by the petition without having studied the points involved in the particular case.

† Evidently intended to subscribe to this petition, but sheet bearing his signature was not included in his reply.

‡ Deceased.

² See paragraph 14 below.

II.—THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CASE.

- 3. This case was circulated to the members of the International Commission in January 1935, when it was arranged that it and the other Hymenoptera cases submitted at the same time should be dealt with at the meeting of the Commission due to be held at Lisbon in September of that year, by which time the recommendations of the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature would be available.
- 4. This case was considered by the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature at their meeting held at Madrid in the second week of September 1935, during the Sixth International Congress of Entomology. After careful consideration, the International Committee formed the conclusion that it was desirable that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should use their plenary powers in order to preserve the longestablished name *Pompilus* Fabricius, 1798, with the family name POMPILIDAE, since, having regard to the literature as a whole, confusion rather than uniformity would result from the supersession of these names by the names Psammochares Latreille, 1796, and PSAMMOCHARIDAE. The International Committee agreed, therefore, to recommend that the name Psammochares Latreille and also Pompilus Schneider, 1784 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea), if that name had in fact been published as a generic name, should be suppressed.3 As regards the genus Pompilus Fabricius, the International Committee were of the opinion that the most satisfactory course would be for the International Commission to designate Pompilus pulcher Fabricius, 1798, as its type.
- 5. The above and other recommendations adopted by the International Committee at their meeting held at Madrid were confirmed by the Sixth International Congress of Entomology at the Concilium Plenum held at Madrid on 12th September 1935.

III.—THE CONCLUSION REACHED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE.

6. When the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature met at Lisbon immediately after the close of the Sixth International Congress of Entomology in September 1935, they found themselves confronted with a large number of cases involv-

³ See paragraph 14 below.

ing proposals for the suspension of the rules, in respect of some of which advertisements had not been published or, if published, had not been published for the prescribed period, owing to the illness of Dr. C. W. Stiles, Secretary to the Commission, or for other causes. In these circumstances, the Commission decided at their meeting held on the morning of Monday, 16th September 1935 (Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 9) that immediate consideration should be given to all cases submitted to the Commission that, in their judgment, had reached the stage at which a decision could properly be taken; that the By-Laws of the Commission should be suspended during the Lisbon Session to such extent as might be necessary to give effect to this decision; and that, in so far as this procedure involved taking decisions "under suspension of the rules" in cases where the prescribed advertisement procedure had not been complied with, the cases in question should be duly advertised as soon as might be practicable after the conclusion of the Lisbon Congress and that no Opinion should be rendered and published thereon until after the expiry of a period of one year from the date on which the said advertisement was despatched to the prescribed journals for publication. The case of Pompilus Fabricius, 1798, Psammochares Latreille, 1796, and Pompilus Schneider, 1784, was one of the cases in question and was accordingly dealt with by the Commission under the above procedure.

7. This case was considered by the International Commission at their meeting held on the afternoon of Monday, 16th September 1935 (Lisbon Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 2), when the Commission agreed 4:—

- (b) under "suspension of the rules" permanently to reject the following generic names:—
 - (11) Psammochares Latreille, 1796, Précis Caract. Ins.: 115
 - (18) Pompilus Schneider, 1784, Samml. verm. Abh.: 128 (if intended as a generic name ⁵)
- (c) under "suspension of the rules" to set aside all type designations for the undermentioned genera and to declare their types to be the species indicated below:—

⁵ See paragraph 14 below.

⁴ Only those portions of conclusion 2 which refer to the present case are here quoted. For the full text of Conclusion 2, see 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1:27-30.

Name of genus

Type of genus

(27) Pompilus Pompilus pulcher Fabricius, 1798, Fabricius, Suppl. Ent. syst.: 249 1798, Suppl. Ent. syst.:

(d) under "suspension of the rules" to place on the Official List of Generic Names the sixteen generic names enumerated in (c) above (names (19) to (34)), each with the type species there indicated; (e) to render Opinions in the sense of (a) to (d) above.

- 8. The foregoing decision was embodied in paragraph 27 of the report, which at their meeting held on the morning of Wednesday, 18th September 1935, the Commission unanimously agreed (Lisbon Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion 6) to submit to the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology.
- 9. At the same meeting the Commission agreed (Lisbon Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion 10) that Commissioner Karl Jordan (President of the Commission) and the new Secretary to the Commission, when elected, should be authorised to make such arrangements and to take such other action, as might appear to them to be necessary or expedient: -
 - (i) to establish the Secretariat of the Commission at its new headquarters;

(ii) to secure the due publication of the Opinions agreed upon from time

to time by the Commission;

(iii) to give effect to the decisions reached by the Commission at their Lisbon Session;
(iv) to obtain the finance required for the due functioning of the Com-

mission; and generally (v) to secure the effective continuance of the work of the Commission.

10. The report adopted by the Commission on the morning of Wednesday, 18th September 1935, was unanimously approved by the Section on Nomenclature at its joint meeting with the International Commission held on the afternoon of the same day. It was thereupon submitted to the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology by which it was unanimously approved and adopted at the Concilium Plenum held on the afternoon of Saturday, 21st September 1935, the last day of the Congress.

II. In accordance with the decision taken by the Commission at Lisbon in regard to their procedure at that Session (paragraph 6 above), this case was duly advertised in 1936 in two or more of the journals specified in the Resolution adopted by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in March 1913, by which the said International Congress conferred upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

plenary power to suspend the rules as applied to any given case where, in the judgment of the Commission, the strict application of the rules would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity.⁶ In the period that has elapsed since the advertisement in the said journals of the proposed suspension of the rules in the case of the names dealt with in the present Opinion, the Commission have received two communications objecting to the suspension of the rules in this case. These communications are as follows:-

(a) Document forwarded under cover of a letter dated 1st March 1937 by Dr. S. A. Rohwer in the name of the Committee on Nomenclature of the Entomological Society of Washington

THE CASE OF POMPILUS FABR., 1798

The genus Psammochares was proposed by Latreille, 1796 (Précis Caract. Gen. Insect., p. 115), without included species. In 1802 (Hist. Nat. Crust. & Insect., vol. 3:335) the same author cited Pompilus viaticus F. as an example of Pompilus and in his discussion of this genus remarked 'I'avois etabli le premier ce genre sous le nom de psammochare." In 1803 (Now. Dict. Hist. Nat., vol. 5:158) Latreille definitely cited Sphex fusca (L.), which was one of the 37 species originally included in Pompilus by Eabricius as type of Psammochares. This type fixation is in accordance Fabricius, as type of Psammochares. This type fixation is in accordance with present usage. In 1810 (Consid. gén., p. 437) he designated "Pompilus viaticus Fab." = Sphex viatica L. genotype of Pompilus. Recent examination of the type of viatica has shown (Haupt, Deut. Ent. Zeit., 1927, Beiheft p. 308; Richards, Trans. ent. Soc. Lond. 83: 165, 1935) that, based on viatica, Pompilus must be considered identical with Podalonia Spinola, 1853.9 Furthermore it has not yet been conclusively shown that *Pompilus* Fabr., 1798, is not preoccupied by *Pompilus* Schneider, 1784. 10 Both are recognized as generic names in Sherborn's *Index Animalium* and in the

recognized as generic names in Sherdorn's Inaex Animatium and in the Nomen. Animatium Gen. et. Subgen. now being issued.

Since Banks, 1910 (Jour. N.Y. Ent. Soc. vol. 18:114), called attention to the fact that Psammochares Latr., has priority over Pompilus Fabr. the principal workers in the family have employed the name Psammochares for this genus. Included among these are Banks, Haupt, 11 Arnold, 11 Gussakovsky, Nielsen, Grandi, 11 Turner, Williams, 11 Brèthes, Bernard, Maréchal, Richards, 11 and Sustera. During this period the name Pompilus has virtually appropriate only in connection with scattered biological notes. has virtually appeared only in connection with scattered biological notes. To reject now the prior Psammochares Latr. in favor of the subsequent Pompilus Fabr. would result in overturning the nomenclature of the group

⁶ See Declaration 5 (1943, Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 1:31-40).

The correct date is [1802-1803]. See footnote 1.

⁸ The remainder of Latreille's observation here quoted reads as follows: —" J'abandonne volontiers cette dénomination pour prendre celle de pompile, qui est plus douce à l'oreille."

9 The correct date for this name is [1851]. The reference is Mem. Accad

Sci. Torino (2) 13 (1): 53.

10 See paragraph 14 below.

¹¹ It will be seen from paragraph 2 of the present *Opinion* that this author's name is one of those included in the list of signatories of the petition submitted to the International Commission in favour of the suspension of the rules in this case.

which has been nearly uniform for the past twenty-five years, during which time more progress has been made in the taxonomy of this family than in any other similar period.

In this case only confusion can result from the proposed action under

suspension of the rules.

(b) Extract from a letter dated 28th March 1937 from Dr. Charles D. Michener, Berkeley, California

Psammochares is the name now in general use, and is correct without a suspension of the rules.

- 12. Immediately upon their receipt by the Commission, copies of the documents from which the passages quoted in paragraph 11 have been extracted were communicated (April 1937) to each member of the Commission, but since that date no member of the Commission has expressed himself as being in agreement with the representations contained therein.
- 13. The representations set out in paragraph II above were considered at the Plenary Conference between the President of the Commission and the Secretary to the Commission convened in London on 19th June 1939 under the authority of the Resolution adopted by the Commission at their meeting held at Lisbon on 18th September 1935 (for the text of which see paragraph 9 above). The Plenary Conference (Plenary Conference, 1st Meeting, Conclusion 9) 12:—
 - (b) examined the communications that had been received during the prescribed period in regard to the undermentioned names:—
 - (viii) Pompilus Fabricius, 1798 from the Committee on Nomenclature of the Entomological Society of Washington; and from Charles D. Michener, Berkeley, California.
 - (c) took note that, although copies of the communications referred to in (b) above had been transmitted to each member of the Commission immediately upon their receipt, no member of the Commission had expressed himself as being in agreement with any of the representations contained therein;
 - (d) agreed that the communications referred to in (b) above brought forward no data and adduced no considerations that had not been before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature when at Lisbon in 1935 they approved the recommendations in favour of the suspension of the rules in these cases submitted to them by the International Committee on Entomological Nomenclature in resolutions adopted during the meeting of the Sixth International Congress of Entomology at Madrid in the same year;

¹² Only those portions of Conclusion 9 which relate to the present case are here quoted. For the full text of Conclusion 9, see 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 76-77.

- (e) agreed that, in view of (c) and (d) above, the proper course for the present Conference in the discharge of the duties entrusted to it by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (Lisbon Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion 10) was to give effect to the decisions in this matter reached by the International Commission at their Lisbon Session (3rd Meeting, Conclusion 2) and therefore that Opinions should be issued as soon as possible in the sense indicated in paragraph 27 of the report submitted by them to the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology and approved and adopted by that Congress at the Concilium Plenum held at Lisbon on 21st September 1935.
- 14. At the meeting held at Lisbon on Wednesday, 18th September 1935, at which the International Commission agreed upon their report to the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology (Lisbon Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion 6), the Commission agreed also "to authorise Commissioner Hemming to examine the report after the close of the Congress when works of reference were available to him, for the purpose of checking the accuracy of the bibliographical and other references cited therein, and to correct any errors that might be found before the text of the report was officially printed" (Lisbon Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion I(c)). One of the questions which was left for subsequent determination in this way was whether, as alleged by certain authors, there existed a generic name Pompilus Schneider, 1784, and whether, in consequence, the name Pompilus Fabricius, 1798, dealt with in the present Opinion, would be a homonym, unless the earlier name Pompilus Schneider was suppressed by the Commission under their plenary powers. This question was accordingly investigated jointly by Commissioner Hemming and Commissioner Karl Jordan (President of the Commission), when in the spring of 1943 Commissioner Hemming began the preparation of the present Opinion. A careful study was made of the work entitled Sammlung vermischter Abhandlungen zur Aufklärung der Zoologie und der Handlungsgeschichte published by Schneider (J. G.) in 1784, 13 the work in which, as it was alleged, that author had published the word Pompilus as a generic name. This examination showed conclusively: -
 - (i) that Schneider used the word "Pompilus" not as a generic name but as the trivial name of one of the species there included by him in the genus Octopodia Schneider (then diagnosed for the first time on page 108 of the Sammlung);

¹³ The copy of Schneider's *Sammlung* examined was the copy which formerly belonged to the late Dr. C. D. Sherborn, which is now preserved in the Zoological Library of the British Museum (Natural History).

(ii) that the mistaken view that the name *Pompilus* and certain other similarly placed names had been used by Schneider as generic names was due probably to the fact (a) that the specific trivial name *Pompilus* and the other specific trivial names concerned were printed in large conspicuous type and with a capital initial letter, while (b) the name of the genus (*Octopodia* Schneider) to which these species were referred was printed inconspicuously and in the same type as that used for the immediately following diagnosis given for that genus;

(iii) that the species to which Schneider applied the specific trivial name "Pompilus" (i.e. the species to which he applied the (binominal) specific name Octopodia Pompilus Schneider) is the species previously named Nautilus pompilius by Linnaeus in 1758, Syst. Nat. (ed. 10) 1:709, this being clearly shown by the reference thereto cited

by Schneider;

(iv) that the reason why Schneider applied the specific trivial name pompilus to the species previously named Nautilus pompilus by Linnaeus was that, as a scholar and the editor of many classical works, he considered that the scientific names of animals should, so far as possible, be the "original Greek or Latin names" for those species. 14

- 15. The results (summarised above) of the examination of Schneider's Sammlung thus made it perfectly clear that the validation of the generic name Pompilus Fabricius, 1798 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) decided upon by the International Commission at Lisbon in 1935 ¹⁵ does not involve (as it was then thought that it might) the suppression (under the Commission's plenary powers) of an earlier generic name, Pompilus Schneider, 1784, since, in fact, Schneider never published any such generic name. There is no evidence of any kind to suggest that any author used the word "Pompilus" as a generic name in any other work prior to the publication of the name Pompilus by Fabricius in 1798, but, in order to provide against this remote contingency, it remains desirable that provision should be made in the Opinion validating Pompilus Fabricius, 1798, for the suppression of any such use of the name Pompilus.
- 16. The present *Opinion* was concurred in by the twelve (12) Commissioners and Alternates present at the Lisbon Session of the International Commission, namely:—

Commissioners:—Calman; Hemming; Jordan; Pellegrin; Peters; and Stejneger.

Alternates:—do Amaral vice Cabrera; Ohshima vice Esaki; Bradley vice Stone,; Beier vice Handlirsch; Arndt vice Richter; and Mortensen vice Apstein.

15 See paragraph 7 of the present Opinion.

¹⁴ For the text of the report prepared by Commissioner Hemming in conjunction with Commissioner Jordan, see the Appendix to the present *Opinion*.

- 17. The present *Opinion* was dissented from by no Commissioner or Alternate present at the Lisbon Session. Nor since that Session has any Commissioner who was neither present on that occasion nor represented thereat by an Alternate indicated disagreement with the conclusions then reached by the Commission in this matter
- 18. The following five (5) Commissioners who were not present at Lisbon nor represented thereat by Alternates did not vote on the present *Opinion*:—

Bolivar y Pieltain; Chapman; Fantham; Silvestri; and Stiles.

19. At the time when the vote was taken on the present *Opinion*, there was one (I) vacancy in the Commission consequent upon the death of Commissioner Horváth.

IV.—AUTHORITY FOR THE ISSUE OF THE PRESENT OPINION.

Whereas the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in March 1913, adopted a Resolution conferring upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, acting for the International Congress of Zoology, plenary power to suspend the rules as applied to any given case, where, in the judgment of the Commission, the strict application of the said rules would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity, provided that not less than one year's notice of the possible suspension of the rules as applied to the said case should be given in two or more of five journals specified in the said Resolution, and provided that the vote in the Commission was unanimously in favour of the proposed suspension of the rules; and

Whereas the suspension of the rules is required to give valid force to the provisions of the present *Opinion* as set out in the summary thereof; and

Whereas not less than one year's notice of the possible suspension of the rules as applied to the present case has been given to two or more of the journals specified to in the Resolution adopted by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in March 1913; and

Whereas the vote in the Commission at their Lisbon Session was unanimously in favour of the issue of an *Opinion* in the terms of the present *Opinion*;

Now, THEREFORE,

I, Francis Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, acting in virtue of all and every the powers conferred upon me in that behalf by reason of holding the said Office of Secretary to the International Commission, hereby announce the said *Opinion* on behalf of the International Commission, acting for the International Congress of Zoology, and direct that it be rendered and printed as *Opinion* Number One Hundred and Sixty Six (*Opinion* 166) of the said Commission.

In faith whereof I, the undersigned Francis Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have signed the present *Opinion*.

Done in London, this twenty second day of June, Nineteen Hundred and Forty Three, in a single copy, which shall remain deposited in the archives of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

FRANCIS HEMMING

APPENDIX TO OPINION 166

On the status of the name Pompilus and certain other names commonly alleged to have been published as generic names by Schneider (J. G.) in 1784, Sammlung vermischter Abhandlungen zur Aufklärung der Zoo-logie und der Handlungsgeschichte, and on matters incidental thereto.

By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.)

At their Session held at Lisbon in 1935 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature agreed to use their plenary powers for the purpose of validating the generic name *Pompilus* Fabricius, 1798, *Suppl. Ent. syst.*: 212 (type: *Pompilus pulcher* Fabricius, 1798, *Suppl. Ent. syst.*: 249) (Lisbon Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 2(b)(18) and (c)(27), published in 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 28, 29). The principal question involved in that case was the situation created by the existence of the older name Psammochares Latreille, 1796, for this genus. There was, however, a secondary problem arising from the alleged publication of the name Pompilus as a generic name by Schneider (J. G.) in 1784, Sammlung vermischter Abhandlungen zur Aufklärung der Zoologie und der Handlungsgeschichte: 128, since, if there had been such a generic name as Pompilus Schneider, 1784, the name Pompilus Fabricius, 1798, would have been invalid as a homonym, quite apart from the difficulties created by the existence of the name *Psammochares* Latreille, 1796. After careful consideration, the International Commission unanimously agreed to overcome these difficulties (i) by suppressing the name Psammochares Latreille, 1796, under their plenary powers and (ii) by suppressing under the same powers the name *Pompilus* Schneider, 1784, "if intended as a generic name."

2. It was not possible at Lisbon to consult a copy of Schneider's *Samm*-

lung and, in order to provide for this and certain similar cases, the International Commission at their meeting held at Lisbon on 18th September 1935 agreed "to authorise Commissioner Hemming to examine the report after the close of the Congress when works of reference were available to him, for the purpose of checking the accuracy of the bibliographical and other references cited therein, and to correct any errors which might be found before the text of the report was officially printed" (Lisbon Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion (1c), published in 1943, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 1:44). Accordingly, the problem created by the alleged existence of the generic name Pompilus Schneider, 1784, was examined by Commissioner Francis Hemming, Secretary to the Commission, jointly with Commissioner Karl Jordan, President of the Commission, in the early part of 1943, when the text of *Opinion* 166, containing the Commission's decision in regard to *Pompilus* Fabricius, 1798, was in course of preparation.

3. The results of the examination of Schneider's *Sammlung* of 1784 may

be summarised as follows:-

(a) The title of the article in Schneider's Sammlung in which the name "Pompilus" appears is: "Charakteristik des ganzen Geschlechts und der einzelnen Arten von Blakfischen," the article in question extending from page 103 to page 134.

(b) In the above article, Schneider:-

(i) referred (:105) to the 10th edition of the Systema Naturae of Linnaeus and quoted the diagnosis there given by Linnaeus for the genus Sepia Linnaeus, 1758, Syst. Nat. (ed. 10) 1:658 (though he did not cite the date of the 10th edition or give the page reference);
(ii) referred to the above diagnosis by the expression "Geschlechtskarakter";

(iii) said that he could not retain in its entirety and without alteration the "Geschlechtskarakter" (diagnosis) given by Linnaeus for the genus Sepia Linnaeus;

(iv) gave a new "Geschlechtskarakter" for this genus covering all the species ("Arten") which he regarded as referable

thereto;

(v) set out (:108) the revised "Geschlechtskarakter" in Latin accompanied with a version in German, thus:-Caput cum oculis inter pedes et ventrem . . . Octopodia. (and so on) Blakfisch. Kopf und Augen zwischen Leib und Füssen . . . Blakfisch.

(vi) stated that he had selected as the name of the "Geschlecht" the word "Octopodia" employed in late Greek, in place of the ancient name Polypus ("Ich habe zum allgemeinen Geschlechtsnamen ein Wort gewählt, welches die neuern Griechen statt des alten Polypus brauchten"), and accordingly placed the name Octopodia at the head of the Latin text of the "Geschlechtskarakter" (quoted in (v) above) of this genus, the counterpart in the German version being "Blakfisch" (that name being derived from the German word "blaken," used to denote the "smoking" of a candle or lamp);

(vii) divided the "Geschlecht" Octopodia Schneided into two groups

("Classen"), to which, however, he applied no names;
(viii) stated that he gave to each species its old Greek or Latin name ("damit ich hernach einer jeden Art ihren alten griechischen oder lateinischen Namen wieder geben möchte ").

(ix) enumerated under the names shown in (c) below the eight species which he referred to the genus Octopodia Schneider.

(c) The following are the species referred by Schneider to the genus Octopodia Schneider:

Note:—The following points should be noted: (a) Schneider cited the generic name Octopodia Schneider only on page 108 and did not repeat it in combination with the specific trivial names of the eight species referred by him to that genus, each of those species being cited by him only by its specific trivial name, that name being printed with a capital initial letter (as "Sepia," "Loligo," etc.); (b) As explained in (b)(viii) above, Schneider did not regard as new names the specific trivial names which he employed, but looked on them as old names revived, though in fact five of them are new names nomenclatorially, since Schneider was the first author to publish them after 1757 as the specific trivial components of binominal names formed in accordance with the system instituted by Linnaeus in 1758 formed in accordance with the system instituted by Linnaeus in 1758.

ERSTE CLASSE (: 109)

(i) Octopodia sepia Schneider, 1784

Schneider showed that his "Sepia" was the same species as Sepia officinalis Linnaeus, 1758, Syst. Nat. (ed. 10) 1:658, no. 2. ("Diese Art hält sich in Meer näher am Strande no. 2. ('auf.'')

(ii) Octopodia loligo (Linnaeus, 1758)

This species is *Sepia loligo* Linnaeus 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1:** 659, no. 4. ("Dies soll nach Linnee [sic] die grosse Art des Rondelet und Needham sein.")

(iii) Octopodia teuthis Schneider, 1784

This species is the same as Sepia media Linnaeus, 1758, Syst. Nat. (ed. 10) 1:659, no. 3. ("Dies ist die Art, welche Linnee [sic] Media nennt.")

(iv) Octopodia sepiola (Linnaeus, 1758)

This species is Sepia sepiola Linnaeus, 1758, Syst. Nat. (ed. 10) 1:659, no. 5. (Schneider says of this species: "Diese Art ist bunt.".)

ZWEYTE [sic] CLASSE (:116)

(v) Octopodia polypus Schneider, 1784

This species is the same as Sepia octopodia Linnaeus, 1758, Syst. Nat. (ed. 10) 1:658, no. 1. Schneider used the specific trivial name polypus because it was the old Greek name for this and, therefore, preferable, in his opinion, to the name octo-podia used by Linnaeus in 1758. (Schneider says of this species: "Die Hauptschriftsteller von dieser Art, welche in dem angeführten Kennzeichen mit einander übereinstimmen, sind Herr Hasselquist und Koelreuter.")

(vi) Octopodia moschites Schneider, 1784

The name moschites does not appear in the 10th edition of Linnaeus. The description given by Schneider was based on classical and later accounts. The name moschites is derived from modern Greek: "Die neuern Griechen sollen ihn μοσχίτης nennen."

(vii) Octopodia nautilus Schneider, 1784

Schneider made it clear that this species is the same as Argonauta argo Linnaeus, 1758, Syst. Nat. (ed. 10) 1: 708, no. 231. Schneider added: "Diese Art hat Aristoteles mit Recht zu dem Geschlechte der Meerpolypen gezahlt."

(viii) Octopodia pompilus [[recte] pompilius] (Linnaeus, 1758)

This is the species named Nautilus pompilius by Linnaeus in 1758, Syst. Nat. (ed. 10) 1: 709, no. 233. The spelling of the specific trivial name as "pompilius" instead of pompilius" was due either to an error of transcription on the part of Schneider or to a deliberate return to classical spelling. Schneider said of this species: "Ich gebe dieser Art den Namen, welchen Linnee [sic] aus dem Plinius beigelegt hat, ob er ihr gleich nicht zukommt."

(d) In view of the fact that Linnaeus erroneously placed the genera Argonauta Linnaeus, 1758, and Nautilus Linnaeus, 1758, among the univalve mollusca, Schneider, when uniting these genera with Sepia Linnaeus, 1758, to form the genus Octopodia Schneider, 1784, was quite justified in using the expression "des ganzen Geschlechts" in the title of his article and in saying, as regards his own diagnosis ("Geschlechtskarakter") of the genus Octopodia Schneider, that it covered all the species referred by him to that genus.

4. It will be seen from the foregoing analysis of Schneider's Sammlung of 1784 that there is no such generic name as Pompilus Schneider, 1784, and in consequence that the name Pompilus Fabricius, 1798, has at no time been a homonym. Accordingly, no difficulty arises under this head in

connection with Opinion 166.

5. Certain nomenclatorial issues, unconnected with *Opinion* 166, are, however, disclosed by the examination of Schneider's *Sammlung*. As it is clearly most desirable that, where it is necessary in a given Opinion (as in Opinion 166) to examine the status of a particular name (as Octopodia pompilus Schneider, 1784), account should be taken of the effects of the conclusions reached not only as regards the particular name in question but also as regards any other name or names, the status of which is identical with that of the name examined. In the present case it is desirable, therefore, to examine the status of the other names used by Schneider in the article in which he described the species Octopodia pompilus [sic] (Linnaeus, 1758). The following notes are accordingly added, in order to show how the conclusions reached in regard to the specific trivial name "pompilus" used by Schneider for species no. 8 in his genus Octopodia affect the other names used by him in the same article. Finally, a note is added in regard to the position of the generic name Octopodia Schneider, 1784.

6. The position as regards the specific trivial names used by Schneider in 1784 for species placed by him in the genus Octopodia Schneider may be

summarised as follows:-

- (1) There is no force in either of the two arguments which at different times have been advanced against accepting as available under the Règles Internationales the names first published by Schneider in his Sammlung in 1784, namely:
 - (a) that it is not clear that he used the expression "Geschlecht" as the equivalent of the expression "genus" of Linnaeus; and (b) that he divided the "Geschlecht" Octopodia into "Classen,"
 - thereby departing from the binary system of nomenclature.
- (2) As regards objection I(a) above, it has already been shown conclusively in Section (b) of paragraph 3 of the present paper that Schneider's expression "Geschlecht" is identical with the expression "genus" as used by Linnaeus. Further, it should be noted that in various forms the expression "Geschlecht" has often been used by other authors as the equivalent of the expression "genus" and, therefore, that Schneider's use of this expression in this sense, though now not usual, is far from being unique. For example, towards the end of the XVIIIth century and at the beginning of the XIXth century, the word "Geschlecht" was in quite common use as the designation for the systematic category next above the category of "species" and as the equivalent, therefore, of the expressions "genus" (Latin), "genre" (French), "Gattung" (German), "geslacht" (Dutch), and "slägt" (Swedish). Moreover, these words are all still in use to the present day in works on systematic zoology. The following are examples of such usage at various dates:
 - (a) Fuessli, 1778, Mag. Ent. 1:2 & ff. (Review of Voet's Catalogus systematicus Coleopterorum): "Genus primum: Scarabaeus. Von diesem Geschlechte sind bis S. 34 überhaubt 153 Arten beschrieben und abgebildet. S. 35 folgt: Genus secundum, Copris, Von diesem Geschlechte sind erst 10 Arten beschrieben . . ." (and so on).

(b) Helmuth, 1808, Naturgeschichte 5. "Das Geschlecht der Kolbenkäfer, Scarabaeus" (:24); "Das Geschlecht der Bockkäfer, Cerambyx" (:41); "Das Geschlecht der Wasserkäfer. Dytiscus" (:48)... (and so on).
(c) A. van Bemmelen, in Herklots, 1858, Bouwstoffen voor eene Fauna

van Nederland 2: 140. "Ons land is rijk an soorten van het geslacht Cyprinus; de best bekende zijn:" (Here follows a list of 6 species: Cyprinus rutilus, Cyprinus brama, etc.).

(d) Reuter, 1880, in Ent. Tidskr. 1: 117. "Slägtöfversigt" (i.e.

' survey (or key) of genera '').

(3) Objection (1)(b) above rests on the argument that Schneider was not an author who applied the principles of binary nomenclature and, therefore, that names published by him do not satisfy the requirements of proviso (b) to Article 25 of the Règles Internationales. only evidence brought forward in support of this contention is that Schneider divided the "Geschlecht" Octopodia Schneider, 1784, into two groups (which he called "Classen"), intermediate in rank between genus and species. This objection is ill-founded, (a) because Schneider did not give names to his "Classen" and (b) because, even if he had given names to his "Classen," such action would still not have constituted a departure from the principles of binary nomenclature. Quite apart from the fact that the Règles Internationales recognise (Articles 6-10) the subgenus as a category intermediate between the genus and the species, it should be noted that many strictly binominal authors from the time of Linnaeus onwards have established groups within a genus identical with the "Classen" established by Schneider and that many of these authors have given Latin names (in the nominative plural) to the groups so established. See, for example, the six named groups established by Linnaeus within the genus *Gryllus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1: 425–433 (Class Insecta, Order Orthoptera). In actual fact, as will be seen from paragraph 3(c) of the present paper, Schneider in his *Sammlung* of 1784 employed a strictly binominal system of nomenclature. Since a binominal system of nomenclature is *ex hypothesi* a binary system of nomenclature, it is not necessary here to consider whether Schneider used a system of nomenclature, which, though not binominal, was nevertheless a binary system in the sense in which that expression is interpreted in *Opinion* 20. This is fortunate, since the validity of the interpretation of the expression "binary nomenclature" as given in that Opinion is at present sub judice (see 1943, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 1: 45, 55).

(4) In view of (2) and (3) above, no grounds exist on which either the generic or the specific trivial names first published by Schneider in his Sammlung of 1784 can be rejected as not satisfying the requirements of the Règles Internationales. All such names possess, therefore, rights under the Law of Priority as from 1784.

(5) The only new generic name published by Schneider in the article under discussion was *Octopodia* Schneider, 1784 (see paragraph 7 below). All the other generic names alleged to have been published by Schneider in that article are cheironyms (being based upon a misreading of the trivial names used by Schneider for species of the genus Octopodia Schneider) and should, therefore, be deleted from all zoological Nomenclators. The cheironyms in question are:—

Loligo Schneider, 1784, Samml. verm. Abhandl. Aufklär. Zool.: 110 Moschites Schneider, 1784, ibid.: 118 Polypus Schneider, 1784, ibid.: 116

Pompilus Schneider, 1784, ibid.: 128 16 Sepiola Schneider, 1784, ibid.: 116 Teuthis Schneider, 1784, ibid.: 113

(6) In consequence of the elimination of the first five of the above cheironyms, the following names are no longer invalid by reason of being homonyms:-

Loligo Lamarck, 1798, Bull. Sci. Soc. philomat., Paris 17: 130 Moschites Hoyle, 1901, Mem. Proc. Manchester lit. phil. Soc. 45

(No. 9) : 1 Polypus Leach, 1817, Zool. Miscell. 3: 139

- Pompilus Fabricius, 1798, Suppl. Ent. syst.: 212 Sepiola Leach, 1817, Zool. Miscell. 3: 140 (7) The elimination of the cheironym Teuthis Schneider, 1784 (and of the cheironyms Nautilus Schneider, 1784, and Sepia Schneider, 1784, if either of these names have been cited in scientific publications) can have no effect upon the nomenclature of the groups concerned, since, even if such generic names had been published by Schneider in 1784, they would have been invalid as homonyms under Article 34 of the Règles Internationales, in view of the existence of the prior names Teuthis Linnaeus, 1766, Nautilus Linnaeus, 1758, and Sepia Linnaeus, 1758.
- 7. The position as regards the generic name Octopodia Schneider, 1784, may be summarised as follows:-
 - (1) The generic name Octopodia Schneider, 1784, Samml. verm. Abhandl. Aufklär. Zool.: 108, is a nomenclatorially available name, since:
 - (a) it was published with a definition (see paragraph 3(b)(v) above), thereby satisfying the requirements of proviso (a) to Article 25 of the Règles Internationales; and
 - (b) was published by an author who applied a strictly binominal system of nomenclature, and, therefore, ex hypothesi a binary system of nomenclature (see paragraphs 3(c) and 6(3) above), thereby satisfying the requirements of proviso (b) to Article 25.
 - (2) In view of (1) above, all uses of the word Octopodia as a new generic name by later authors are invalid, since the generic name Octopodia as used by such authors is a homonym of Octopodia Schneider, 1784. Accordingly, the names Octopodia Gray, 1847, Proc. zool. Soc. Lond. 15 (178): 205, and Octopodia Grimpe, 1925, Wiss. Meeresuntersuch., Abh. Helgoland 16 (3): 13, are invalid under Article 34 of the Règles Internationales.

(3) At the time when the generic name Octopodia Schneider, 1784, was published, Octopodia polypus Schneider, 1784 (one of the included species) already possessed a name (Sepia octopodia Linnaeus, 1758), of which the specific trivial component consisted of the same word (octopodia) as that selected by Schneider as the name for his new genus (Octopodia).

(4) In view of (3) above and of the fact that Schneider did not designate a type for the genus Octopodia Schneider, 1784, the type of that genus is Octopodia polypus Schneider, 1784, by absolute tautonymy under

rule (d) in Article 30 of the Règles Internationales.

¹⁶ The name *Pompilus* Fabricius, 1798, which, apart from being considered a homonym of *Pompilus* Schneider, 1784, was invalid as a synonym of Psammochares Latreille, 1796, has been validated by the Internationa Commission in Opinion 166 (see pp. 377-387 above).

8. Now that it is seen that Octopodia Schneider, 1784, is an available generic name and that Octopodia polypus Schneider, 1784 (= Sepia octopodia Linnaeus, 1758) is the type of this genus, it will be necessary to consider the position of the name Octopus Cuvier, [1797], Tabl. elem.: 380 (= Octopus Lamarck, 1798, Bull. Soc. Sci. philomat., Paris 17: 130), since clearly greater confusion than uniformity would result from the substitution of the name Octopodia Schneider, 1784, for the name Octopus Cuvier, [1797]. Specialists interested in this question are accordingly invited to communicate with the International Commission.

FRANCIS HEMMING.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Secretariat of the Commission, at the British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, LONDON, S.W.7.

25th July 1943.

THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE COMMISSION.

(obtainable at the Publications Office of the Commission at 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.)

Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.

This journal has been established by the International Commission as their Official Organ in order to provide a medium for the publication of :—

- (a) proposals on zoological nomenclature submitted to the International Commission for deliberation and decision;
- (b) comments received from, and correspondence by the Secretary with, zoologists on proposals published in the *Bulletin* under (a) above; and
- (c) papers on nomenclatorial implications of developments in taxonomic theory and practice.

The *Bulletin* was established in 1943. So far, six Parts have been published. Further Parts are in the press.

Opinions and Declarations Rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The above work is being published in three volumes concurrently, namely:—

Volume I. This volume will contain Declarations I-9 (which have never previously been published) and Opinions I-I33 (the original issue of which is now out of print). Parts I-20 (containing Declarations I-9 and Opinions I-II) have now been published. Further Parts will be published shortly.

Volume 2. This volume will be issued in 52 Parts, comprising all the decisions taken by the International Commission at their meeting at Lisbon in 1935, namely *Declarations* 10–12 (with Roman pagination) and *Opinions* 134–181 (with Arabic pagination). Part 52 will contain the index and title page of the volume. Parts 1–37, containing *Declarations* 10–12 and *Opinions* 134–167, have now been published. Further Parts will be published shortly.

Volume 3. This volume, which commenced with Opinion 182, will contain the Opinions adopted by the International Commission since their meeting at Lisbon in 1935. Parts I—II (containing Opinions 182-192) have now been published. Further Parts will be published as soon as possible.

APPEAL FOR FUNDS

The International Commission appeal earnestly to all institutions and individuals interested in the development of zoological nomenclature to contribute, according to their means, to the Commission's Special (Publications) Fund. Of the total sum of £1,800 required to enable the Commission to issue all the publications now awaiting printing, donations amounting to £969 16s. 1d. were received up to 30th June 1945. Additional contributions are urgently needed in order to enable the Commission to continue their work without interruption. Contributions of any amount, however small, will be most gratefully received.

Contributions should be sent to the International Commission at their Publications Office, 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W. 7, and made payable to the "International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature or Order" and crossed "Account payee. Coutts & Co.".

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY RICHARD CLAY AND COMPANY, LTD., BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

